

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections in view of the present claim amendments.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner rejected claim 8 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants submit that claim 8 as amended is patentable subject matter because the data structure is claimed as part of a statutory machine. (*See Annex IV (a), Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility*) (“Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. USPTO personnel should determine whether the computer program being claimed is part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such as case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim.” *Id.*)

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (US 6,477,589; “Suzuki”). Applicants traverse this rejection as follows.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus connected to a bus of a single system together with first information processing means and second information processing means that can be isolated from the bus.

In contrast, Suzuki discloses a network system wherein apparatuses are only connected to each other via the IEEE 1394 serial bus. Furthermore, Suzuki does not disclose an information apparatus comprising a bus inputting terminal connected to the bus (IEEE 1394 bus) and another

inputting terminal that is directly connected to second information processing means, wherein the second information processing means can be isolated from the bus. This combination of features is not disclosed in Suzuki.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki. Furthermore, claims 2-6 are allowable, at least because of their dependency.


Claims 7 and 8 recites similar features, thus, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
David P. Emery  
Registration No. 55,154

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 30, 2006